

STATE OF MICHIGAN
COURT OF APPEALS

In the Matter of ELREASE JAMES THOMPSON,
JR., Minor.

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

EBONY WEST,

Respondent-Appellant.

UNPUBLISHED

July 17, 2003

No. 245935

Saginaw Circuit Court

Family Division

LC No. 01-027286

In the Matter of SHA'ROME'RIEONA BIBBS,
a/k/a SHA'ROME'RIEONA WEST, Minor.

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

EBONY WEST,

Respondent-Appellant.

No. 245936

Saginaw Circuit Court

Family Division

LC No. 01-027287

Before: Zahra, P.J., and Talbot and Owens, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

In these consolidated cases, respondent appeals as of right from the trial court order terminating her parental rights to the minor children under MCL 712A.19b(3)(c)(i), (g), and (j). We affirm.

The trial court did not clearly err in finding that the statutory grounds for termination were established by clear and convincing evidence. MCR 5/974(I);¹ *In re Miller*, 433 Mich 331, 337; 445 NW2d 161 (1989); *In re McIntyre*, 192 Mich App 47, 50; 480 NW2d 293 (1991). The evidence showed that the eighteen-year-old respondent had not made progress in obtaining drug treatment, effective counseling services, housing, or employment. Respondent visited the children regularly and loved them very much, but she had not rectified the drug use that had caused the children to become wards of the court. Respondent was also unable to provide proper care or custody of the children as long as she was using drugs, had not obtained necessary parenting skills, and had not found housing for the children. Respondent's lack of progress indicated that the children were likely to suffer physical and emotional harm if returned to respondent.

Although not raised as a separate issue by respondent, the trial court also did not err in finding that termination was not contrary to the children's best interests. MCL 712A.19b(5); *In re Trejo Minors*, 462 Mich 341, 356-357; 612 NW2d 407 (2000). While the evidence established that respondent demonstrated love for the children, it did not indicate that termination of respondent's parental rights was clearly not in their best interests.

Therefore, the trial court did not err in terminating respondent's parental rights to the minor children.

Affirmed.

/s/ Brian K. Zahra
/s/ Michael J. Talbot
/s/ Donald S. Owens

¹ Effective May 1, 2003, the court rules governing proceedings regarding juveniles were amended and moved to the new subchapter MCR 3.900. The provisions on termination of parental rights are found in MCR 3.977. In this opinion, we refer to the rules in effect at the time of the order terminating parental rights.